

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action<sup>1</sup>, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4-7, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication App. No. 2002/0078447 to Mizutome et al. (“*Mizutome*”).

Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 4-7, and 9. Claims 1, 2, 4-7, and 9 remain pending.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-7, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Mizutome*.

Claim 1 recites an electronic apparatus comprising:

... a first selection means for selecting a screen layout from a plurality of screen layout options that are consecutively displayed;

a second selection means for selecting a first constitutive element displaying additional screen layout options on the screen and a second constitutive element displaying a source of information

(emphasis added). *Mizutome* does not disclose the claimed “first selection means.”

*Mizutome* discloses a data processing apparatus “for displaying or outputting information regarding a video, audio, and so on” (paragraph 0012). Fig. 13-17C of *Mizutome* depict screen layouts. The user in *Mizutome* does not select a screen layout “from a plurality of screen layout options that are consecutively displayed.” In contrast, the screen layouts in *Mizutome* depict a single layout. Therefore, *Mizutome* does not

---

<sup>1</sup> The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicant declines to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

teach or suggest "a first selection means for selecting a screen layout from a plurality of screen layout options that are consecutively displayed," as recited in claim 1.

*Mizutome* fails to teach the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, *Mizutome* cannot anticipate claim 1. Thus, claim 1 is allowable for at least these reasons. Claims 2 and 4 are also allowable at least due to their depending from claim 1. Although of difference scope than claim 1, independent claims 5, 6, and 9 are allowable over *Mizutome* for at least the same reasons discussed above in regard to claim 1. Claim 7 is also allowable at least due to its depending from claim 6.

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: January 22, 2008

By:

  
Michael R. Kelly  
Reg. No. 33,921